

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Janice McMullen Jones,

C/A No. 0:21-cv-5-JFA-PJG

Plaintiff,

v.

Pastor; PC Stv; Rev; Policy 01

ORDER

Defendants.

Plaintiff, Janice McMullen Jones, proceeding *pro se*, brings this civil action alleging causes of action similar to those previously dismissed by this court. *See Jones v. Cherry*, C/A No. 0:20-1876; *Jones v. Cherry*, C/A No. 0:20-3489. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this case was referred to the Magistrate Judge for initial review.

After reviewing the Complaint (ECF No. 1), the Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation (“Report”). (ECF No. 14). Within the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this matter be dismissed as duplicative and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The Report sets forth, in detail, the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and this Court incorporates those facts and standards without a recitation.

¹ The Magistrate Judge’s review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.). The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976).

Plaintiff was advised of her right to object to the Report, which was entered on the docket on March 9, 2021. *Id.* The Magistrate Judge required objections, if any, to be filed by March 23, 2020. *Id.* Plaintiff failed to submit any objections. Thus, this matter is ripe for review.

A district court is only required to conduct a *de novo* review of the specific portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report to which an objection is made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *Carniewski v. W. Virginia Bd. of Prob. & Parole*, 974 F.2d 1330 (4th Cir. 1992). In the absence of specific objections to portions of the Magistrate's Report, this Court is not required to give an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Here, Plaintiff has failed to raise any objections and therefore this Court is not required to give an explanation for adopting the recommendation. A review of the Report indicates that the Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that this matter should be dismissed as duplicative and for lack of jurisdiction.

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report, this Court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. Accordingly, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference.

(ECF No. 14). Consequently, this action is summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



April 6, 2021
Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge